REMARKS

Claims 6, and 8 to 27 are pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment herein places this application in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

<u>Citation of GB 2,300,062</u>

GB 2,300,062 ("Phillips") has been cited against he claims in support of the rejections thereof. However, this reference is not listed on the PTO-form 892 provided by the Examiner. Nor was it listed on the PTO-form 1449 provided by applicant. It is respectfully requested that a PTO-form 892 listing this reference be provided to applicant with the next Office Action.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification is amended herein to correct a clerical error, i.e., "Cathay Ray Tub" is changed to "cathode ray tube", as was originally intended. No new matter is being introduced.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 13-15, 18, 20-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for depending from a cancelled claim. The dependency of these claims is corrected by amendment herein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Appln. No.: 10/575,387

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

The Rejections under Prior Art

1. Claims 6 to 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over GB 2,326,505 ("Palmer") in view of GB 2,300,062 ("Phillips"). Palmer and Phillips are directed to gaming machines.

Claim 6 is amended to recite that doorframe (15) is hingedly attached to the gaming machine cabinet (10) and pivotally movable around a substantially vertical edge between an open position and a closed position, and that both the display monitors (28a, 28b) and the game control panel (20) are simultaneously moved to the open position relative to said gaming machine cabinet (10) upon opening of the doorframe (15) to provide access for maintenance to back sides of the display monitors (28a, 28b) and game control panel (20) and to interior components of the gaming machine cabinet (10).

Palmer discloses a front wall frame (10) hingedly attached to a cabinet (1) and which is vertically pivotable around a horizontal edge (13). Palmer does not disclose display monitors attached to the front wall frame (10) and it would be impractical to do so because they would not be supportable on the Frame (10) when it is in the upward position as shown in Fig. 2 of Palmer. Claim 6 as amended excludes Palmer at least in part because it now recites that the doorframe (15) is pivotably movable around a substantially vertical edge.

Phillips discloses a hinged attachment of frame (19) with panel (18) to the housing along an upright edge. See, e.g., Fig. 3, and page 9 line 23 to page 4, line 8. Phillips also discloses that the electrical display devices may be mounted to the panel (18) so as to be removable therewith, and further that the user controls may be mounted on a panel (i.e., panel (9)). See, page 3, line 26

to page 4, line 1. However, as can be seen from Fig. 1 of Phillips, the electrical display devices and user controls cannot both be simultaneously moved to an open position. Panels (9) and (18) are oblique to each other and not hingedly mounted along a single axis of rotation. Module 5, containing panel 9, is disclosed as removed by release of an interlock. Page 9, lines 10 to 13. There is no suggestion that panel 5 be hingedly mounted. Accordingly, even if the teachings of Phillips be combined with those of Palmer the features of claim 6 as amended would not be disclosed or suggested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Palmer.

Claim 26 is amended to recite that the doorframe <u>hingedly</u> attached to the gaming machine cabinet and is pivotably moveable around a substantially vertical edge between an open and closed position with respect to the gaming machine cabinet. This claim is submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as expressed above with respect to claim 6. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Palmer in view of Phillips.

Claim 27 recites, inter alia, that

- the two display monitors (28a, 28b) are securely affixed to said doorframe (15)

and

Appln. No.: 10/575,387

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

- the doorframe (15) is supported on said gaming machine cabinet (10) by means of a hinge so as to open and close said doorframe together with the two display monitors (28a, 28b) and the game control panel (20) relative to said gaming machine cabinet (10),

- the doorframe includes a rim extending upright alongside of the monitors (28a, 28b) and the game control panel (20),
 - the rim has a straight edge along the entire doorframe height,
- the hinge is affixed to the full length of said rim and an inner wall of the gaming machine cabinet (10).

As admitted in the Office Action, Palmer discloses none of these features.

The Phillips device also fails to disclose or suggest these features. In particular, as can be seen from Fig. 1 of Phillips, it is impossible for the Phillips device to have a doorframe having a hinge affixed to the full length of a straight rim extending alongside the full length of the entire doorframe height such that the doorframe, together with the display monitors and the control panel, can be opened and closed together. Phillips discloses a device wherein the planar lower module 5 (containing the control functions 17) and the planar upper module 7 (containing the glass screen 18) are angled with respect to each other and are not mounted to a doorframe hinged to the cabinet. There cannot be a single straight hinge connecting both the upper and lower modules to the cabinet. The comments above with respect to claim 6 explaining the deficiencies of the Phillips disclosure are reiterated herein. Accordingly, the Phillips device neither discloses nor suggests the features of Applicants' invention as recited in claim 27. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Appln. No.: 10/575,387

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above all of the pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance, the same being respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

Adrian T. Calderone Reg. No. 31,746

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Uniondale, NY 11553

Tel: (516) 228-8484 Fax: (516) 228-8516